

Group II - Claims 10-19, drawn to a subcombination universal body assembly,
Group III - Claims 20-29 and 64-70, drawn to a multiple tool attachment
system,

Group IV - Claims 40-49, drawn to a combination demolition tool without a
universal body,

Group V - Claims 50-57, drawn to a method of designing and forming a
demolition tool unit, and

Group VI - Claim 71 (the Examiner apparently inadvertently typed claim 70),
drawn to a subcombination tool set.

The Examiner has required restriction between these Groups. The Applicant
provisionally elects to prosecute the claims of Group I, claims 1-9, 30-39, 58-63, and 72-75,
with traverse.

The present application is generally directed to a body for attaching a
demolition tool to a demolition base. The claims are directed to such a body itself, a system
including the body, and a method for designing the body. The Examiner contends that the
inventions do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because,
under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Unity of invention requires that the
claims all include technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed
inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art (PCT Rule 13.2, 37 C.F.R. §
1.475(a)). The determination of whether a group of inventions is so linked as to form a single
general inventive concept is to be made without regard to whether the inventions are claimed
in separate claims (PCT Rule 13.337, C.F.R. § 1.475(e)). It is apparent from the claims that
all of the claims include the special technical features of the body mentioned above.
Furthermore, the Examiner handling the international application (PCT/US00/28367)
believed unity of invention to exist and conducted a search on all 75 claims.


Moreover, since all of the claims include common subject matter relating to
the body, searches directed to the claims of any of Groups I-VI would clearly overlap each
other. Such co-extensive searching would not present any undue burden on the Examiner for
examination of the claims. Accordingly, restriction of the claims between the allegedly
distinct inventions embodied by these groupings of claims is inappropriate. As such,
withdrawal of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/089,481
Paper Dated January 16, 2004
In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of November 18, 2003
Attorney Docket No. 2005-020399

In view of the above remarks, withdrawal of the restriction requirement and examination of claims 1-75 on the merits are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

WEBB ZIESENHEIM LOGSDON
ORKIN & HANSON, P.C.

By 

Richard L. Byrne
Registration No. 28,498
Attorney for Applicant
700 Koppers Building
436 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219-1818
Telephone: 412-471-8815
Facsimile: 412-471-4094
E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com